DTU Library

Comparison of measurements from optical CMM and focus-variation microscope of a PIM mechanical part

Quagliotti, Danilo; Salaga, Jacek; Tosello, Guido; Hansen, Hans Nørgaard

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Technical University of Denmark
DTU Mechanical Engineering
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Micro/Nano and Precision Manufacturing

European Society for Precision Engineering and Nanotechnology (euspen)
16th International Conference and Exhibition, Nottingham, UK, May 2016

Comparison of measurements from optical CMM and focus-variation microscope of a µPIM mechanical part

Danilo Quagliotti, Jacek Salaga, Guido Tosello, Hans N Hansen

Technical University of Denmark, Department of Manufacturing Engineering, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

Abstract

Two sets of 5 green and 5 sintered mechanical parts, manufactured by micro powder injection moulding (µPIM), were measured using an optical coordinate measuring machine (OCMM) and a focus-variation microscope (FVM). The examined features of size, including diameter, radii and distances, span in the range of (10^{-1}–10^{1}) mm. Comparing the corresponding measurements from the two instruments, a relative maximum deviation of 8 % was found for the linear dimensions of the green parts and a relative maximum deviation of 6 % for the ones of the sintered parts. The maximum relative deviation of the radii was 17 % for the green parts and 30 % for the sintered parts (relative deviations have been evaluated considering focus-variation measurements as reference).

OCMM showed some problems in the detection of the smallest dimensional features (above all radii) where the presence of defects on the edges, quite typical for parts produced by µPIM, was particular critical for the measurements.

The extraction of results obtained from FVM was less critical because performed with a dedicated post-processing software which allowed to better define the measured dimensions. Furthermore, the chance to measure other geometrical features, such as surface texture and flatness, may depict FVM measurements as more attractive. However, measurements should be suitable for in-line quality control, in a production environment, where fast cycle time is required and measuring times are more compatible to those of the OCMM.

Introduction

Quality assurance for micro manufactured parts is a key issue for defect-free production [1]. The selection of the measuring instrument to be used for inspecting the parts is especially difficult when the features of size to be measured are close to one end of the operating range of a measuring technology.

In this view, an optical coordinate measuring machine (OCMM), commonly used in an industrial environment, was opposed to a focus variation microscope (FVM), suitable for laboratory use. A study case served for emphasising related pros and cons: 5 green and 5 sintered parts of a micro mechanical component, manufactured by micro powder injection moulding (µPIM) [2], have been measured and successively compared using the two instruments.

Examples of both green and sintered parts are in Fig. 1. The nominal values of the features of size that have been considered for the sintered parts are instead given in Fig. 2.

Measurement and post-processing

A set of fourteen dimensions were measured, including one diameter, eight radii and five lengths, in the range of (10^{-1}–10^{1}) mm.

The OCMM was *DeMeet 220* with magnification 2×, lateral resolution 4 µm.

The FVM used was *Alicona InfiniteFocus®* with magnification 5×, vertical resolution 500 nm, lateral resolution 7 µm.

Results related to OCMM did not need post-processing since the instrument is equipped with a software [3] which directly provide the values related to the measurements. Conversely, the acquired images using FVM were successively processed by [4]. The software's routine for contour fitting was used to extract the measurements of the features in the *xy*-plane.

Results and uncertainty

The results of the comparison are expressed as relative deviations between the measurements performed by OCMM and FVM, i.e.:

$$\Delta d = \left| \frac{d_{OCMM} - d_{FVM}}{d_{FVM}} \right| \times 100 \qquad (1)$$

being d the generic dimension.

The expanded uncertainty *U* was evaluated according to [5] for both instruments' measurements (Fig. 3 → green parts and Fig. 4 → sintered parts).

Measurements of the green parts showed maximum values of relative deviations of 17 % for radii and 8 % for linear dimensions. Minimum relative deviations observed were 2 % for radii and below 1 % for linear dimensions. Measurements of the sintered parts have maximum values of relative deviations of 30 % for radii and 6 % for linear dimensions. Minimum relative deviations are below 1 % for both.

Conclusions

The measurements of the smallest dimensional features (above all radii) by OCMM were particular critical due to the presence of defects on the edges, quite typical for parts produced by µPIM. This tendency was also noted for sintered parts. The reduction of the dimensions after the sintering process resulted in increased relative deviations between the measurements from the two different instruments.

Moreover, regarding OCMM measurements, radii were measured directly. Linear dimensions were instead measured as segments using the centres of the circles (radii) as inputs. In this way, relative deviations of linear dimensions might have increased by errors propagated from the inputs.

The extraction of results obtained from FVM, which was performed with a dedicated post-processing software [4], allowed to better define the measured dimensions. In addition, it could also be suitable for measuring other geometrical features, such as surface texture and flatness. Nevertheless, measurements by FVM and its post-processing need to be optimised to be suitable for industrial quality control, whereas measuring and processing times are more compatible to those of OCMM.



Figure 1. Overview of the µ-powder injection moulded components. (a) Coin and components comparing sizes. (b) Top: example of green part. Bottom: example of sintered part.



Figure 2. Scheme of micro mechanical component with the nominal values of the examined features of size. Dimensions intended for the sintered parts (final product).



Figure 3. Relative deviations between the measurements of the green parts performed by OCMM and FVM. FVM is considered as reference. Considering the expanded uncertainty *U*, the red-dashed columns ( ) are the relative deviations between the lower limits d_{OCMM}–*U* and d_{FVM}–*U*; while, the red-dotted columns ( ) are the relative deviations between the upper limits d_{OCMM}+*U* and d_{FVM}+*U*.



Figure 4. Relative deviations between the measurements of the sintered parts performed by OCMM and FVM. FVM is considered as reference. Considering the expanded uncertainty *U*, the red-dashed columns ( ) are the relative deviations between the lower limits d_{OCMM}–*U* and d_{FVM}–*U*; while, the red-dotted columns ( ) are the relative deviations between the upper limits d_{OCMM}+*U* and d_{FVM}+*U*.

References

[1] Hansen H N, Hocken R J and Tosello G 2011 Replication of micro and nano surface geometries CIRP Annals – Manufacturing Technology 60 695–714

[2] Piotter V 2011 A review of the current status of MicroPIM: Materials, processing, microspecific considerations and applications Powder Inject. Molding Int. 27–35

[3] Approve for DeMeet v. 1.3.3 Schut Geometrical Metrology, www.schut.com

[4] MoutainsMap® v. 7.0, Digital Surf, www.digitalsurf.com

[5] ISO 15530-3:2011 Geometrical product specifications (GPS) – Coordinate measuring machines (CMM): Technique for determining the uncertainty of measurement – Part 3: Use of calibrated workpieces or measurement standards